

REMARKS

In the subject Office Action, the examiner issued a restriction requirement under 35 USC 121, as between Claims 1-4 and Claims 5-7. Applicants provisionally elect to prosecute Claims 1-4, but request that the examiner reconsider the restriction requirement in view of the following.

Applicants respectfully submit that the restriction requirement is improper because independent Claim 5 could have been presented in dependent form. In particular, Claim 5 merely recites a temporary exception to the method of Claim 1 – namely, that a different control is observed during a period beginning when air conditioning is initially enabled and ending when full cooling capacity is achieved. At the end of the defined period, the control reverts to the method recited in Claim 1. Since the subject matter of Claims 5-7 could have been presented in dependent form, Applicants respectfully request that the restriction requirement be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick M. Griffin, Attorney
Registration No. 29716
Telephone: (248) 813-1215